

Appl. No. 09/683,662

Docket No. DE92000079US1

REMARKS

The examiner has applied Hart and Potega (newly cited) in finally rejecting certain claims of the application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Hart shows a portable device while Potega shows a battery-powered device including a regulator to supply a "spare" battery with an electrical charge while powering/charging the battery-powered device or is primary battery. Applicant's claim 1, however, recites a primary device and a secondary device--both being supplied by a regulated source (the regulated source and the devices may have different voltage requirements). To construct a basis for the rejection, the examiner associates the "spare" battery of Potega with applicant's secondary device (e.g., at least one other independent data processing device), and then goes on to derive motivation from words recited in applicant's claim 1, i.e., "the motivation would be to provide ... one or more *active systems* coupled to and ac/dc adapter to deliver controlled power to both batteries and power *any systems coupled thereto.*" [italicized language were imputed by the examiner but not shown in Potega].

Regarding the rejection of claim 4 and 5, Hart in view of Potega does not discloses "at least one other independent mobile data processing device." The purported assigned power receiving device (Fig. 10) of Potega (i.e., battery) is not equivalent to the claimed secondary data processing device.

In sum, applicant and the examiner disagree on the asserted equivalency between a power-receiving battery device and a power-receiving secondary data processing device.

Without waiving applicant's right to traverse the rejection on other grounds, reconsideration is requested on this narrow question.

Respectfully submitted,
McINTYRE HARBIN & KING


Lawrence Harbin, Reg. No. 27,644
500 Ninth Street, S.E.
Washington, DC 20003
202.546.1100 tel. 202.543-9230 fax